



UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN

Møte 06/2023

Protokoll frå Programstyremøte for kunst og kuratorpraksis (PSKA)

Tirsdag 12.09.2023, kl. 08.00

Teams og møterom 303 M61

Til stede:

Johan Sandborg (programstyreleder)

Chloe Lewis

Eamon O'Kane

Anne Szefer-Karlsen

Tim Parry-Williams

Sara Bjørneset (sekretær)

Katrine Hjelde (observatør)

I) Godkjenning av innkalling og dagsorden

Godkjent

II) Protokoll fra siste møte

Godkjent

PSKA 12/23 Nytt studieprogramoppsett for kuratorpraksis

Vedtak:

Programstyret har ikke samlet seg rundt ett felles vedtak for SAK 12/23.

Ett medlem stilte seg bak følgende vedtaksforslag:

Programstyret anbefaler at det opprettes et nytt erfaringsbasert masterprogram i kuratorpraksis på 90 eller 120 studiepoeng. I tillegg har programstyret følgende bemerkninger:

- *Studieprofilene til både Masterprogrammet i kunst og i kuratorpraksis videreføres best ved at disse fagfeltene består som to forskjellige program med distinkte kvaliteter*
- *Studietilbudet for kuratorpraksis bør henvende seg til søkere med erfaring fra feltet.*



UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN

- *Et nytt studietilbud vil kreve selvfinansiering fra instituttet. Programstyret ber instituttleder vurdere styrking av fagmiljøet iht nasjonale føringer og forskrifter.*

En majoritet av medlemmene har bedt om at følgende begrunnelse tilføres protokollen:

Due to limited time and the complexity of the issue, the Program Board did not reach an agreement on a vedtak at their initial meeting. An agreement was reached regarding the student profile of the Curatorial Practice study offer, but no financing model was agreed upon.

The majority of members met for a second time to continue the discussion, and reached the conclusion that a new Curatorial Practice program should not be financed internally by the institute. Context and reasoning is given in the addendum below.

Addendum / Background:

The Faculty Board has called for revisions to KMD's MA in Curatorial Practice (CP), having identified that it does not adhere to the national quality assurance program. In particular, with only one professor, the Faculty Board has that deemed that CP's professional environment (fagmiljø) is insufficient.

As such, the Faculty Board has tasked the Institute Council with presenting a recommendation on how to approach revisions to CP, and the Program Board functions here as an advisory committee.

The Program Board engaged with this advisory task through a consideration of various models and resource allocations. The Board first explored options to "fold" the MA in Curatorial Practice into the MA in Fine Art as a study direction. After review, the Board does not recommend this approach. In the current CP model, students are recruited from the professional field with at least two years of experience, whereas in the merged model, candidates would apply, for example, straight out of a BA in Fine Art, rendering the profile of CP diminished and altered to the point of being unrecognisable.

It is thereby the Program Board's unanimous view that the study profiles of KMD's MA programs in Fine Art and Curatorial Practice are best continued as two separate programs with distinct qualities. A revised study offer in CP should thereby maintain its form as an independent program and address applicants from the professional field.

The above conclusion was reached on 12/09/23. Possibilities for financing were discussed, but the timeframe of the meeting did not allow for a conclusion to be reached. Several Program Board members requested a follow-up meeting, which was scheduled for 18/09/23 and attended by Johan Sandborg (programstyreleder), Chloe Lewis, Eamon O!Kane, Tim Parry-Williams, and Sara Bjørneset. It is noted that Program Board member Anne Szefer-Karlsen was unavailable



UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN

for the meeting and was sent a summary shortly thereafter.

The Program Board members present at the second meeting came to the conclusion that they do not recommend that a new study offer in CP be self-financed by KMD's Department of Fine Art. This is not to say that the Program Board does not acknowledge the value of CP. Rather, the Program Board concludes that CP cannot be financed by the department without a significant and disproportionate loss to the professional and educational environment of the Fine Art programs (BA and MA).

In the existing model, Fine Art students enter the system with basic funding from the government while CP students do not. The department's economic resources are currently stretched to a critical point – major cuts have recently been made to material budgets, hiring of guests, and other teaching activities. The coming changes to the student financial system will deliver additional financial challenges. As such, the Fine Art department can no longer allocate from its operating budget the equivalent of basic funding to the CP program, as it has in recent years.

One approach moving forward could be to divide the 29 MA study places between Fine Art and CP study programs, leaving MA Fine Art with 19 study places and thus allowing CP students to receive basic funding from the government. The operating budget, work space, and teaching positions associated with these 10 study places would also be transferred from Fine Art to CP.

After close consideration, the Program Board finds that this model would result in a highly disproportionate allocation of resources and student-staff ratio (3-to-1 in CP vs 11-to-1 in FA) and thereby does not support the transfer of Fine Art resources, whether in the form of students, staff, or work space, due to the assessed negative impact of such a transfer on the quality, environment, and economy of the Fine Art program.

The Program Board additionally notes the following: The current open teaching positions in Fine Art only cover the baseline of two to three teachers per focus area plus one theory professor, and Fine Art thereby cannot re-allocate these positions while maintaining a healthy supervision/subject-teaching environment. Eight 100% professors and sixteen 50% professors in Fine Art is the minimum needed to cover supervision of the Fine Art student cohort. (This is in fact a bit low, since several professors at any moment have reduced tutor group capacity due to research projects, leadership responsibilities, and sabbaticals.) It is also noted that decreasing the student study places in Fine Art will not solve the current space challenges, since the overall number of study places in the department will remain the same.

The Program Board urges the Institute Council to take the above considerations into account when finding a model for CP. The Program Board suggests that the Institute Council consider a model for an externally funded MA study offer in Curatorial Practice that maintains its independent structure and strengthens its fagmiljø through the addition of teaching staff. Such external funding could, for example, be generated through the implementation of an EVU



UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN

(tuition-based) model, an application to the government for additional basic funding, institutional collaborations, etc. The Program Board recognises that this process will take time, and suggests that modules in Curatorial Practice be offered within Fine Art in the interim, so that Fine Art students may benefit from this educational component in parallel to their practice and theory-based study.

The Program Board emphasises that its position does not reflect a negative assessment of CP as a program, not at all. As the department's advisory council, the Program Board has a responsibility to look holistically at the department's resources and present a perspective based in equitability, and the position presented here is grounded in this responsibility.